



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,823	03/29/2004	Jang Hui Cho	46500-000614/US/COA	1001

30593 7590 01/28/2008
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 8910
RESTON, VA 20195

EXAMINER

SHIBRU, HELEN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,823

Applicant(s)

CHO ET AL.

Examiner

HELEN SHIBRU

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9, 11 and 14-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9, 11, and 14-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments filed on 12/13/2007 have been entered and made of record. Claims 1-4, 9, 11, 14-38 are pending.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4, 9, 11, and 14-38 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 9, 11, and 14-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (US PG PUB 2002/0046328) in view of Yamamoto (US Pat. No. 5,742,569) and further in view of Saeki (US PG PUB 2001/0043790).

Regarding claim 1, Okada discloses a computer readable recording medium having a data structure for managing reproduction of at least video data representing multiple reproduction paths, comprising: a data area storing at least video data as a transport stream in more than one file, each file associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths, and the files being interleaved with one another (see page 2 paragraphs 0034-0037, page 8 paragraph 0175, paragraph 0193 and 0234, and figures 4, 26, and 29).

Claim 1 differs from Okada in that the claim further requires a navigation area storing a first navigation unit, the first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units and controlling a reproduction order of the second navigation units, at least one second navigation unit referencing more than one map, each map associated with different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce.

In the same field of endeavor Yamamoto discloses a navigation area storing a first navigation unit, the first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units and controlling a reproduction order of the second navigation units (see fig. 6, col. 12 lines 1-34, where it teaches the PGCI includes program information and cell information, col. 15 line 29- col. 16 line 40 and figs. 7A and 7B). Therefore in light of the teaching in Yamamoto it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Okada by including navigation units in order to control the data.

Claim 1 further differs from the above proposed combinations in that the claim further requires at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce.

In the same field of endeavor Saeki discloses at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce (see fig. 9 where it shows cell #1 referencing more than one map and each map are associated with one of the files. See also the abstract, paragraphs 0067, 0100, 0107-0118 and fig. 11). Therefore in light of the teaching in Saeki it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2621

invention was made to modify the above proposed combination by providing a navigation data item referencing more than one map in order to arrange address.

Regarding claim 2, Okada discloses the transport packets associated with each reproduction path are grouped into data blocks, and the transport packets of each reproduction path are interleaved with one another on a data block by data block basis (see page 2 paragraphs 0034-0037, page 8 paragraph 0175, paragraph 0193 and 0234, and figures 4, 26, and 29, see also fig. 5 in Yamamoto).

Regarding claim 3, Okada discloses wherein each data block represents at least an intra-coded picture of video data (see figure 12 and paragraphs 0005-0009 in page 1 and paragraph 0167 in page 8 in Okada and fig. 2 in Yamamoto).

Regarding claim 4, Okada discloses wherein each data block represents at least one group of pictures (GOP) (see figure 4 in Okada and fig. 2 in Yamamoto).

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, Okada discloses a computer-readable recording medium having a data structure for managing reproduction of at least video data representing multiple reproduction paths, comprising:

a data area storing a transport stream of at least video data, the transport stream being divided into transport packets, each of the transport packets associated with one of the multiple reproduction paths, and the transport packets of each reproduction path being interleaved with one another (see rejection of claim 1 above); and

Claim 11 differs from Okada in that the claim further requires a navigation area including a first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units, the second navigation unit

Art Unit: 2621

providing navigation information for reproducing each of the multiple reproduction paths and, including a multiple reproduction path indicator indicating that the second navigation unit provides navigation information for multiple reproduction paths.

In the same field of endeavor Yamamoto discloses a navigation area storing a first navigation unit, the first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units and controlling a reproduction order of the second navigation units (see fig. 6, col. 12 lines 1-34, where it teaches the PGCI includes program information and cell information, col. 15 line 29- col. 16 line 40 and figs. 7A and 7B). Therefore in light of the teaching in Yamamoto it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Okada by including navigation units in order to control the data.

Claim 11 further differs from the above proposed combinations in that the claim further requires at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce.

In the same field of endeavor Saeki discloses at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce (see fig. 9 where it shows cell #1 referencing more than one map and each map are associated with one of the files. See also the abstract, paragraphs 0067, 0100, 0107-0118 and fig. 11). Therefore in light of the teaching in Saeki it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above proposed combination by providing a navigation data item referencing more than one map in order to arrange address.

Regarding claim 14, Okada discloses each reproduction path represents a digital channel (see pages 1-2).

Regarding claims 15, Okada discloses each reproduction path represents a sub-channel of an RF channel (see pages 1-2).

Regarding claims 16 and 17, limitation of claims 16 and 17 can be found in claim 1 above. Therefore claims 16 and 17 are analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 18, Okada discloses an apparatus for recording a data structure for managing reproduction duration at least video data representing multiple reproduction paths, comprising: a driver for driving an optical recording device to record data on the recording medium (see figure 12 which shows a driver circuit 63); a controller for controlling the driver to record a transport stream of at least video data on the recording medium, the transport stream being divided into transport packets, each of the transport packets associated with one of the multiple reproduction paths, and the transport packets of each reproduction path being interleaved with one another (see figure 12 which shows the driver circuit controlled by the controller MPU, and rejection of claim 1).

Claim 18 differs from Okada in that the claim further requires the controller configured to control the driver to record a first navigation unit on the recording medium, the first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units and controlling a reproduction order of the second navigation units, at least one of the second navigation units referencing more than one third navigation unit, each third navigation unit indicating a separate file of video data to reproduce.

In the same field of endeavor Yamamoto discloses a navigation area storing a first navigation unit, the first navigation unit including one or more second navigation units and controlling a reproduction order of the second navigation units (see fig. 6, col. 12 lines 1-34, where it teaches the PGCI includes program information and cell information, col. 15 line 29- col. 16 line 40 and figs. 7A and 7B). Therefore in light of the teaching in Yamamoto it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Okada by including navigation units in order to control the data.

Claim 18 further differs from the above proposed combinations in that the claim further requires at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce.

In the same field of endeavor Saeki discloses at least one navigation data item referencing more than one map, each map being associated with a different one of the multiple reproduction paths and indicating a separate file of video data in the data area to reproduce (see fig. 9 where it shows cell #1 referencing more than one map and each map are associated with one of the files. See also the abstract, paragraphs 0067, 0100, 0107-0118 and fig. 11). Therefore in light of the teaching in Saeki it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the above proposed combination by providing a navigation data item referencing more than one map in order to arrange address.

Claim 19 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 18 above.

Regarding claim 20, the limitation of claim 20 can be found in claim 1 above. Therefore claim 20 is analyzed and rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1.

Regarding claim 21, Saeki discloses a number of the third navigation units associated with the at least one of the second navigation units is equal to a number of the multiple reproduction paths (see figure 9).

Regarding claim 22, Yamamoto discloses at least one of the second navigation units includes a field indicating whether the at least one of the second navigation units provides navigation information for multiple reproduction paths (see figures 6 and 7A-7B. See also claim 1 rejection above).

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reason as discussed in claim 1 above.

Claims 24, 25 and 26 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 2-3, and 15 respectively above.

Claims 27-29 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 2-3, and 15 respectively above.

Claims 30-32 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 2-3, and 15 respectively above.

Claims 33-35 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 2-3, and 15 respectively above.

Claims 36-38 are rejected for the same reason as discussed in claims 2-3, and 15 respectively above.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HELEN SHIBRU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7329. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, THAI Q. TRAN can be reached on (571) 272-7382. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2621

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Helen Shibru
January 7, 2008



THAI Q. TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
BIOLOGY CENTER 2600